

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-8 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 3 are amended, and Claim 2 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. As Claim 1 is amended herein to incorporate the subject matter recited by now-canceled Claim 2, which is illustrated in Figures 6 and 7 of the application as originally filed, and the dependency of Claim 3 amended accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added.

**Entry of Response Proper**

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration on the part of the Examiner as the Amendment merely clarifies the claimed features of the invention by incorporating the subject matter recited in now-canceled Claim 2 into independent base Claim 1, the subject matter having been previously considered by the Examiner as evidenced by the arguments asserted in the outstanding Office Action; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to objections raised in the Final Rejection. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

The final Office Action dated November 18, 2009 rejects: Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,075,294 to Van den Boom et al. (Van den Boom) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,304,967 to Hayashi and U.S. Patent No. 6,740,834 to Sueyoshi et al. (Sueyoshi '834); Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,883,840 to Sueyoshi et al. (Sueyohsi '840) in view of Van den Boom, Hayashi and Sueyoshi '834; Claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van den Boom in view of Hayashi and Sueyohsi '834 as applied to Claims 4 and 5, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,769,154 to Klein et al. (Klein); and Claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sueyoshi '840 in view of Van den Boom, Hayashi, and Sueyoshi '834 as applied to Claims 4 and 5, and further in view of Klein.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the following reason(s).

Claim 1 recites a vehicle door outer handle system including, among other features, an operating handle having a handle main body made of a synthetic resin and a cover made of a synthetic resin so as to cover the outer side of the handle main body, the operating handle being disposed on an outer side of a vehicle door; a pair of electrodes; and a circuit board on which is provided a detection circuit for detecting a change in capacitance between the electrodes, ***wherein, among opposite faces of the circuit board, a component of the detection circuit is mounted on the face of the circuit board that is opposite to the face of the circuit board where the electrodes are patterned,*** and wherein a covering portion made of synthetic resin

covers the ground plate and is also disposed between the ground plate and the electrodes.

An exemplary embodiment of the above-emphasized feature is illustrated in Figures 6 and 7 of the originally filed application, wherein it can clearly be seen that a pair of electrodes is patterned on one of the faces of the circuit board (see Figure 7), while components of the detection circuit are mounted on the opposite face of the circuit board (see Figure 6). An advantage and/or benefit flowing from the recited structural feature of the handle system is that the feature facilitates making the operating handle thinner than conventional operating handles.

Applicants note the Office Action admits Van den Boom fails to teach or suggest the features of a component of the detection circuit being mounted on a face on the side of the circuit board that is opposite to the face where the electrodes are patterned.

To cure the admitted deficiency of Van den Boom, the Office Action looks to Hayashi and asserts that such features are discussed in column 8, lines 1-11 of Hayashi. Applicants note the cited passage of Hayashi specifically states:

The interstage circuit board 43 is constituted by a multi-layer circuit board (two-layer), and trimming electrodes 51, 52, and 53 are formed in a thick film pattern on the first layer 43-1 thereof. The trimming electrodes 52 and 53 are formed in one linked-pattern.

On the second layer 43-2 of the interstage circuit board (multi-layer circuit board), the capacitor electrodes 54, 55, and 56 are formed in a thick film conductor pattern, and also the through-holes 57 are formed. The capacitor electrodes 54 and 55 are formed in one linked-pattern.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the above quoted passage of Hayashi, as well as the corresponding figures relating thereto, merely teach and

illustrate, respectively, that a number of electrodes 44-47, 51-56 are mounted on one or opposite faces of a two layered circuit board 43. The cited passage, as well as the remainder, of Hayashi is totally silent as to any teaching or suggestion of a "component" of any detection circuit being mounted on any face of the circuit board 43, let alone a face that is on an opposite side of the circuit board 43.

Applicants note dielectric resonators 41, 42 are provided adjacent to the circuit board 43, but the resonators 41, 42 are merely electrically connected to the electrodes of the circuit board 43 via terminals 48, 49 of the resonators 41, 42, wherein the terminals 48, 49 do not correspond to a component of the detection circuit and are definitely not mounted on the circuit board 43.

Accordingly, Hayashi does not cure or otherwise address the admitted deficiency of Van den Boom.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining cited references also fail to cure or otherwise address the above-discussed deficiencies of Van den Boom.

For example, Sueyoshi '834 is cited for teaching the use of potting material to cover certain electronic elements. Yet, Sueyoshi '834, like Hayashi, fails to cure or otherwise address the admitted deficiency of Van den Boom.

Sueyoshi '840 is cited for teaching a handle being a component of a main handle body and a cover. Thus, Sueyoshi '840, like Hayashi and Sueyoshi '834, fails to cure or otherwise address the admitted deficiency of Van den Boom.

Klein is cited for teaching a holder being provided to hold electric components within a handle main body. As such, Klein, like Hayashi, Sueyoshi '834 and Sueyoshi '840, fails to cure or otherwise address the admitted deficiency of Van den Boom.

Accordingly. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is not rendered obvious in view of Van den Boom, Hayashi, Sueyoshi '834, Sueyoshi '840, and Klein, either alone or in any combination thereof, and should therefore be deemed allowable.

Claims 3-8 depend from Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable for at least the same reason(s) Claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of Claims 1 and 3-8, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing attorney docket number 107348-00543.**

Respectfully submitted,



Murat Ozgu  
Registration No. 44,275

**Customer No. 004372**

ARENT FOX LLP

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400

Washington, D.C. 20036-5339

Tel: (202) 857-6000; Fax: (202) 638-4810

MO:elp